

# **Close Relationships (PSY 644)**

## **Syllabus - Fall 2016**

### **General Seminar Information:**

*Instructor:* Dr. Christopher R. Agnew  
Department of Psychological Sciences, Purdue University  
Psychological Sciences Building, Rm. 2162  
Office Phone: (765) 494-6061 / E-mail: [agnew@purdue.edu](mailto:agnew@purdue.edu)

*Seminar hours:* Tuesdays 1:30 pm to 4:20 pm in PSYC, Room 2102

*Office hours:* By appointment, at your convenience

*Readings:* Available online in pdf format via Blackboard Learn

### **Seminar Plan and Philosophy:**

The goal of this seminar is to acquaint participants with theory and research relevant to understanding critical elements of close relationships (initiation, commitment, maintenance, and dissolution), including coverage of evolutionary, attachment, and interdependence approaches. Methodological and data analytic issues relevant to relationship research will also be examined. Through active involvement with readings, discussions, and presentations, participants will critically examine this rapidly growing area of social psychological research.

The value of a seminar is a function of the quality of individual contributions to each meeting. I'll provide a basic structure for our meetings, but beyond that, the seminar will succeed on the strengths of our joint individual efforts. We're all responsible for the quality of this seminar experience. Accordingly, active participation by everyone is strongly encouraged.

### **Seminar Evaluation:**

Seminar grades are based on the following five components, weighted as noted:

#### *(I) Reading and Discussion (20%):*

Each week, all seminar participants are responsible for reading the assigned material and are expected to actively participate in discussion. This component of your seminar grade will reflect my assessment of your level of involvement in our weekly discussions.

#### *(II) Discussion Leader (20%):*

Students will be responsible for leading our discussion of the assigned readings each week. To aid in this process, discussant leaders are to prepare, in advance, 8 to 10 discussion questions. These questions (typed, with copies provided to all seminar participants) will be used to direct our group discussion. Lead discussants are free to structure their questions as they wish (perhaps questioning theories, hypotheses, methods, results, broader meanings of the readings, etc.). Seminar enrollment will determine the number of times each student will serve as lead discussant. Assignment to topics will be determined during our first meeting.

## **Close Relationships (PSY 644)**

### **Syllabus - Fall 2016 – Page 2**

#### *(III) Article Presentation (10%):*

Each student will prepare and present an in-class presentation of an empirical article with relevance to close relationships. Article presentation options appear in the reading list below for each class topic. These presentations serve two functions. First, they are a means of exposing the class to research beyond the articles that all of us read. Second, they are a means of learning an important skill -- how to present an empirical paper in a limited amount of time. In 15 minutes, you will *summarize* the (a) theory and hypotheses, (b) method, (c) results, and (d) broader relevance of an article. Making appropriate use of visual media, covering only what absolutely needs to be covered, and presenting clearly what you have to say in no more than 15 minutes (the typical time allotted at a conference) are essential components of an effective academic presentation.

#### *(IV) Hypothesis Testing (20%):*

Empirical testing of both established and new ideas advances our understanding of close relationships. Because all seminar topics are active areas of research, each is amenable to hypothesis testing. To that end, each seminar participant will bring a hypothesis to each class meeting (only one hypothesis; typed; keep it brief, no more than a few sentences – one sentence is fine), inspired by the week's readings. We will then clarify and work out ways to test your hypotheses together at our meetings. Please bring two copies of your hypothesis to class. You will keep the first copy, noting any ideas generated by the group for referral in considering possible research proposal topics (described below). The second copy is the one you will hand in to me at the conclusion of each class. One of your hypotheses will serve as the subject of your research proposal and proposal presentation (described below).

#### *(V) Research Proposal and Proposal Presentation (30%):*

To strengthen your ability to link research hypotheses with specific operational definitions, empirical procedures, and analyses, you will prepare a research proposal based upon one of your hypotheses (described above). Proposals should include: (a) a title page; (b) an abstract page; (c) an introduction, including a discussion of relevant theory and research and development/justification of one or more testable hypotheses; (d) a method section that thoroughly describes how you plan to test your hypotheses (a description of your sample, data collection procedure, possible scale items, etc.); (e) a discussion of how your data will be analyzed (e.g., establishing the reliability and validity of your measures; if experimental, conducting any necessary manipulation checks; specification of what sort of statistical analyses would be employed to test each of your hypotheses); (f) consideration of limitations of your proposed research; and (g) references. The proposal should be written in APA style (6<sup>th</sup> edition), and it should not exceed 15 double-spaced pages (excluding title page, abstract page, and reference pages). Proposals are due by the last day of class (December 6). You will also make an oral presentation of your proposal to the class at one of our two final class meeting (on either November 29 or December 6). Use of PowerPoint or other visual media is encouraged. Time allocated for each presentation will be determined by seminar enrollment (generally 15 to 20 minutes per presentation).

# Close Relationships (PSY 644)

## Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 3

### Typical Seminar Format:

Introductory remarks → 10 minutes  
Discussion of assigned readings → 1 hour and 20 minutes  
Break → 10 minutes  
Article presentation → 25 minutes (including questions)  
Hypothesis testing → 45 minutes

### Seminar Topic Schedule:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Topic</u>
August 23	Introductions / Overview / Assignments / Welcome to Relationship Science
August 30	Evolutionary Approaches
September 6	Attachment Approaches
September 13	Interdependence Approaches
September 20	Social Cognitive Approaches
September 27	Methodological and Data Analytic Issues in Relationship Research
October 4	Relationship Initiation
October 11	<i>No Class (Fall Break)</i>
October 18	Relationship Commitment
October 25	Relationship Maintenance
November 1	Social Context and Dyadic Relationships
November 8	Technology, Social Media and Dyadic Relationships
November 15	Relationship Dissolution
November 22	<i>No Class (Thanksgiving)</i>
November 29	Research Proposal Presentations
December 6	Research Proposal Presentations

### Seminar Readings:

#### August 23: Welcome to Relationship Science

##### *Assigned Reading:*

- Reis, H. T. (2012). A history of relationship research in social psychology. In A.W. Kruglanski & W Stroebe (Eds.), *Handbook of the history of social psychology* (pp. 213-232). New York: Psychology Press.
- Campbell, L., & Simpson, J. A. (2013). The blossoming of relationship science. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 3-10). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

## Close Relationships (PSY 644) Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 4

### **August 30: Evolutionary Approaches**

#### *Assigned Readings:*

- Kenrick, D. T., Neuberg, S. I., & White, A. E. (2013). Relationships from an evolutionary life history perspective. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 3-10). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Maner, J. K., & Ackerman, J. M. (2013). Love is a battlefield: Romantic attraction, intrasexual competition, and conflict between the sexes. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 137-160). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gildersleeve, K., Haselton, M. G., & Fales, M. R. (2014). Do women's mate preferences change across the ovulatory cycle? A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 1205-1259
- Moss, J. H., & Maner, J. K. (2016). Biased sex ratios influence fundamental aspects of human mating. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42, 72-80.
- Eastwick, P.W. (2016). The emerging integration of close relationships research and evolutionary psychology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 25, 183-190.

#### *Potential Presentations:*

- Pazda, A. D., Prokop, P., & Elliot, A. J. (2014). Red and romantic rivalry: Viewing another woman in red increases perceptions of sexual receptivity, derogation, and intentions to mate-guard. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40, 1260-1269.
- Jonason, P. K., Garcia, J. R., Webster, G. D., Li, N. P., & Fisher, H. E. (2015). Relationship dealbreakers: Traits people avoid in potential mates. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41, 1697-1711.

## **Close Relationships (PSY 644)**

### **Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 5**

#### **September 6: Attachment Approaches**

##### *Assigned Readings:*

For a helpful overview of adult attachment theory and research by Chris Fraley of U of Illinois, please read the material located here: <http://www.psych.uiuc.edu/~rcfraley/attachment.htm>

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, 5, 1-22.

Fraley, R. C. (2002). Attachment stability from infancy to adulthood: Meta-analysis and dynamic modeling of developmental mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 6, 123-151.

Brumbaugh, C. C., & Fraley, R. C. (2006). Transference and attachment: How do attachment patterns get carried forward from one relationship to the next? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 552-560.

Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2013). The role of attachment security in adolescent and adult close relationships. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 66-89). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Overall, N. C., & Simpson, J. A. (2015). Attachment and dyadic regulation processes. *Current Opinions in Psychology*, 1, 61-66.

##### *Potential Presentations:*

Arriaga, X. B., Kumashiro, M., Finkel, E. J., VanderDrift, L. E., & Luchies, L. B. (2014). Filling the void: Bolstering attachment security in committed relationships. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5, 398-406.

Overall, N. C., Girme, Y. U., Lemay, E. P., & Hammond, M. D. (2014). Attachment anxiety and reactions to relationship threat: The benefits and costs of inducing guilt in romantic partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 235-256.

## **Close Relationships (PSY 644)**

### **Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 6**

#### **September 13: Interdependence Approaches**

##### *Assigned Readings:*

Kelley, H. H. (1991). Lewin, situations, and interdependence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 47, 211-233.

Holmes, J. G. (2004). The benefits of abstract functional analysis in theory construction: The case of interdependence theory. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 8, 146-155.

Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (2009). The architecture of interdependent minds: A motivation-management theory of mutual responsiveness. *Psychological Review*, 116, 908-928.

Arriaga, X. B. (2013). An interdependence theory analysis of close relationships. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 39-65). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Fitzsimons, G. M., Finkel, E. J., & vanDellen (2015). Transactive goal dynamics. *Psychological Review*, 122, 648-673.

##### *Potential Presentations:*

Lydon, J., & Karremans, J. C. (2015). Relationship regulation in the face of eye candy: A motivated cognition framework for understanding responses to attractive alternatives. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1, 10-13.

VanderDrift, L. E., & Agnew, C. R. (2014). Relational consequences of personal goal pursuits. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 927-940.

## **Close Relationships (PSY 644)**

### **Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 7**

#### **September 20: Social Cognitive Approaches**

##### *Assigned Readings:*

Banase, R., & Imhoff, R. (2013). Implicit cognition and relationship processes. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 475-499). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Aron, A., Lewandowski, G. W., Mashek, D., & Aron, E. N. (2013). The self-expansion model of motivation and cognition in close relationships. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 90-115). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

McNulty, J. K., Olson, M. A., Meltzer, A. L., & Shaffer, M. J. (2013). Though they may be unaware, newlyweds implicitly know whether their marriage will be satisfying. *Science*, 342, 1119-1120.

Tan, K., & Agnew, C. R. (2016). Ease of retrieval effects on relationship commitment: The role of future plans. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42, 161-171.

Iannone, N. E., McCarty, M. K., & Kelly, J. R. (in press). With a little help from your friend: Transactive memory in best friendships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.

##### *Potential Presentations:*

Etcheverry, P. E., & Le, B. (2005). Thinking about commitment: Accessibility of commitment and prediction of relationship persistence, accommodation, and willingness to sacrifice. *Personal Relationships*, 12, 103-123.

McNulty, J. K., Baker, L. R. & Olson, M. A. (2014). Implicit self-evaluations predict changes in implicit partner evaluations. *Psychological Science*, 25, 1649-1657.

## **Close Relationships (PSY 644)**

### **Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 8**

#### **September 27: Methodological and Data Analytic Issues in Relationship Research**

##### *Assigned Readings:*

- Charania, M., & Ickes, W. J. (2006). Research methods for the study of personal relationships. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 51-71). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Aron, A., Melinat, E., Aron, E. N., Vallone, R. D., & Bator, R. J. (1997). The experimental generation of interpersonal closeness: A procedure and some preliminary findings. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 363-377.
- Bolger, N., Davis, A., & Rafaeli, E. (2003). Diary methods: Capturing life as it is lived. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 579-616.
- Finkel, E. J., & Eastwick, P. W. (2008). Speed-dating. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 17, 193-197.
- West, T. V. (2013). Repeated measures with dyads. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 731-749). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

##### *Potential Presentations:*

- Tenney E. R., Vazire S., Mehl M. R. (2013). This examined life: The upside of self-knowledge for interpersonal relationships. *PLoS ONE* 8(7): e69605.
- Slatcher, R. B., Selcuk, E., & Ong, A. D. (2015). Perceived partner responsiveness predicts diurnal cortisol profiles 10 years later. *Psychological Science*, 26, 972-982.



## Close Relationships (PSY 644) Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 9

### **October 4: Relationship Initiation**

#### *Assigned Readings:*

- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Knee, C., Patrick, H., & Lonsbary, C. (2003). Implicit theories of relationships: Orientations toward evaluation and cultivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 41-55.
- Graziano, W. G., & Bruce, J. W. (2008). Attraction and the initiation of relationships: A review of the empirical literature. In S. Sprecher, A. Wenzel, & J. Harvey (Eds), *Handbook of relationship initiation*, pp. 269-295. New York: Psychology Press.
- Cavallo, J. V., Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (2013). Regulating interpersonal risk. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 116-134). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, J. J., Stinson, D. A., & Wood, J. V. (2013). The bold and the bashful: Self-esteem, gender, and relationship initiation. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 4, 685-692.

#### *Potential Presentations:*

- Stinson, D. A., Cameron, J. J., & Robinson, K. J. (2014). The good, the bad, and the risky: Self-esteem, rewards and costs, and interpersonal risk regulation during relationship initiation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 32, 1109-1136.
- Sprecher, S., & Treger, S. (2015). The benefits of turn-taking reciprocal self-disclosure in get-acquainted interactions. *Personal Relationships*, 22, 460-475.

## Close Relationships (PSY 644)

### Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 10

#### **October 18: Relationship Commitment**

##### *Assigned Readings:*

- Rusbult, C. E., Agnew, C. R., & Arriaga, X. B. (2012). The Investment Model of Commitment Processes. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology, Volume 2* (pp. 218-231). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Arriaga, X. B., & Agnew, C. R. (2001). Being committed: Affective, cognitive, and conative components of relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 1190-1203.
- Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (2015). Maintaining mutual commitment in the face of risk. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 1, 57-60.
- Segal, N., & Fraley, R. C. (2016). Broadening the investment model: An intensive longitudinal study on attachment and perceived partner responsiveness in commitment dynamics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33, 581-599.
- Lemay, E. P., Jr. (2016). The forecast model of relationship commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 111, 34-52.

##### *Potential Presentations:*

- Hui, Chin Ming; Finkel, E. J., Fitzsimons, G. M., Kumashiro, M., Hofmann, W. (2014). The Manhattan effect: When relationship commitment fails to promote support for partners' interests. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 546-570.
- Ogolsky, B. G., & Surra, C. A. (2014). A comparison of concurrent and retrospective trajectories of commitment to wed. *Personal Relationships*, 21, 620-639.

## Close Relationships (PSY 644)

### Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 11

#### **October 25: Relationship Maintenance**

##### *Assigned Readings:*

Aron, A., Norman, C. C., Aron, E. N., McKenna, C., & Heyman, R. E. (2000). Couples' shared participation in novel and arousing activities and experienced relationship quality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 273-284.

Showers, C. J., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2004). Organization of partner knowledge: Relationship outcomes and longitudinal change. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 1198-1210.

Agnew, C. R., & VanderDrift, L. E. (2015). Relationship maintenance and dissolution. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology: Vol. 3. Interpersonal relations* (pp. 581-604). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Murray, S. L., Holmes, J. G., Griffin, D. W., Derrick, J. L. (2015). The equilibrium model of relationship maintenance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108, 93-113.

Cloutier, A., & Peetz, J. (in press). People, they are a changin': The links between anticipating change and romantic relationship quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.

##### *Potential Presentations:*

Girme, Y. U., Overall, N. C., & Faingataa, S. (2014). "Date nights" take two: The maintenance function of shared relationship activities. *Personal Relationships*, 21, 125-149.

Huynh, A. C., Yang, D. Y. J., & Grossmann, I. (in press). The value of prospective reasoning for close relationships. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*.

## Close Relationships (PSY 644) Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 12

### **November 1: Social Context and Dyadic Relationships**

#### *Assigned Readings:*

Agnew, C. R., Loving, T. J., & Drigotas, S. M. (2001). Substituting the forest for the trees: Social networks and the prediction of romantic relationship state and fate. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 1042-1057.

Keneski, E., & Loving, T. J. (2014). Network perceptions of daters' romances. In C. R. Agnew (Ed.), *Social influences on close relationships: Beyond the dyad* (pp. 126-147). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Etcheverry, P. E., & Le, B. (2014). The influence of subjective norms on close relationships. In C. R. Agnew (Ed.), *Social influences on close relationships: Beyond the dyad* (pp. 105-125). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Etcheverry, P. E., & Agnew, C. R. (2016). Predictors of motivation to comply with social referents regarding one's romantic relationship. *Personal Relationships*, 23, 214-233.

Feng, B., & Magen, E. (2016). Relationship closeness predicts unsolicited advice giving in supportive interactions. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33, 751-767.

#### *Potential Presentations:*

Lehmiller, J. J., & Agnew, C. R. (2006). Marginalized relationships: The impact of social disapproval on romantic relationship commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 40-51.

Besikci, E., Agnew, C. R., & Yildirim, A. (in press). It's my partner, deal with it: Rejection sensitivity, normative beliefs, and commitment. *Personal Relationships*.

## **Close Relationships (PSY 644)**

### **Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 13**

#### **November 8: Technology, Social Media and Dyadic Relationships**

##### *Assigned Readings:*

Finkel, E.J., Eastwick, P.W., Karney, B.R., Reis, H. T., & Sprecher, S. (2012). Online dating: A critical analysis from the perspective of psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 13, 3–66.

Forest, A. L., & Wood, J. V. (2012). When social networking is not working: Individuals with low self-esteem recognize but do not reap the benefits of self-disclosing on Facebook. *Psychological Science*, 23, 295–302.

Marshall, T. C., Bejanyan, K., Di Castro, G, & Lee, R. A. (2013). Attachment styles as predictors of Facebook-related jealousy and surveillance in romantic relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 20, 1-22.

Emery, L. F., Muise, A., Dix, E. L., & Le, B. (2014). Can you tell that I'm in a relationship? Attachment and relationship visibility on Facebook. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40, 1466–1479.

Vanden Abeele, M., Schouten, A. P., & Antheunis, M. L. (in press). Personal, editable, and always accessible: An affordance approach to the relationship between adolescents' mobile messaging behavior and their friendship quality. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.

##### *Potential Presentations:*

Rains, S. A., & Brunner, S. R., & Oman, K. (2016). Self-disclosure and new communication technologies: The implications of receiving superficial self-disclosures from friends. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 33, 42-61.

Gormillion, S., Gabriel, S., Kawakami, K., & Young, A. F. (in press). Let's stay home and watch TV: The benefits of shared media use for close relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.

## **Close Relationships (PSY 644)**

### **Syllabus - Fall 2016 - Page 14**

#### **November 15: Relationship Dissolution**

##### *Assigned Readings:*

- Agnew, C. R. (2000). Cognitive interdependence and the experience of relationship loss. In J. H. Harvey & E. D. Miller (Eds.), *Loss and trauma: General and close relationship perspectives* (pp. 385-398). Philadelphia: Brunner-Routledge.
- Lewandowski, G. W., Aron, A., Bassis, S. & Kunak, J. (2006). Losing a self-expanding relationship: Implications for the self-concept. *Personal Relationships*, 13, 317-331.
- Sbarra, D. A., & Hazan, C. (2008). Coregulation, dysregulation, self-regulation: An integrative analysis and empirical agenda for understanding adult attachment, separation, loss, and recovery. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12, 141-167.
- Sbarra, D. A., & Beck, C. J. A. (2013). Divorce and close relationships: Findings, themes, and future directions. In J. A. Simpson & L. Campbell (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of close relationships* (pp. 795-822). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tan, K., Agnew, C. R., VanderDrift, L. E., & Harvey, S. M. (2015). Committed to us: Predicting relationship closeness following non-marital romantic relationship breakup. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 32, 456-471.

##### *Potential Presentations:*

- Lepore, S. J., & Greenberg, M. A. (2002). Mending broken hearts: Effects of expressive writing on mood, cognitive processing, social adjustment and health following a relationship breakup. *Psychology and Health*, 17, 547-560
- Eastwick, P. W., Finkel, E. J., Krishnamurti, T., & Loewenstein, G. (2008). Mispredicting distress following romantic breakup: Revealing the time course of the affective forecasting error. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 800-807.